

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 and 6-7 are currently pending in the application. Although the statement of rejection reads differently, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,528,285 to *Morikawa et al.* (hereinafter *Morikawa*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,073,034 to *Jacobsen et al.* (hereinafter *Jacobsen*). The Examiner rejected Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Morikawa* in view of *Jacobsen*, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0239880 to *Kapellner et al.* (hereinafter *Kapellner*). The Examiner rejected Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Morikawa* in view of *Jacobsen*, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0110544 to *Oyagi et al.* (hereinafter *Oyagi*).

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1, 3 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Applicants respectfully traverse. As presented in the September 5, 2006 Response it is respectfully asserted that a) the “optical system (306)” cited by the Examiner is actually a display module with a display window (309), used as a viewfinder for a camera (see col. 13, ln. 66- col. 14, ln. 8), and as such, the supposed optical system (306) definitely does not emit a beam in a predetermined direction, which beam projects information from the portable terminal cradled within the cradle housing, as recited in Claim 1; b) neither the passage of *Jacobsen* cited by the Examiner, namely col. 12, lns. 32-35, nor *Jacobsen* as a whole teach the recitations in Claim 1 regarding the cradle housing and optical system mounted therein; the cited passage only discloses a lens (202) that can be viewed to enable viewing and voice transmission; and c) the supposed optical system (306) in *Jacobsen* is not mounted within the cradle housing (286), as recited in Claim 1, but instead, it appears that the two are separate; therefore, the display module (306) is not within the alleged cradle housing (286), as recited in Claim 1.

In the Response to Arguments, the Examiner contended that as to point a) the display module projects beams of light that form an image displaying information from the portable

terminal, and thus is broadly an “optical system”; *Jacobsen* uses the word “base” throughout the specification to refer to portions of the cradle and terminal; and as to points b) and c) FIG. 10A shows the optical system to be connected to, if not integral with, the cradle 286; *Jacobsen* contains an implied teaching that the optical systems are a part of the cradle housing rather than the terminal, and it’s well known to make separable portions integral within the housing art.

With respect to the Examiner’s response to a), it is respectfully asserted that even if the viewfinder display module (306) of *Jacobsen* is considered to be an optical system, this element in *Jacobsen* does not emit a beam in a predetermined direction, which beam projects information from the portable terminal cradled within the cradle housing, as recited in Claim 1. The Examiner references col. 12, lines 32-35 in the rejection, but these lines discuss a lens (202) in a separate embodiment in FIG. 8, which lens is not mounted within a side of the lower portion of the cradle housing, as recited in Claim 1. It is respectfully asserted that the cradle housing (286) relied on by the Examiner is not even discussed in this embodiment. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has not satisfied these recitations in the rejection, and as such the §103(a) rejection cannot stand. It is further submitted that the combination of *Morikawa* and *Jacobsen* clearly cannot meet the structural limitations in Claim 1.

With respect to the Examiner’s responses to b) and c), Applicants respectfully assert that the Examiner failed to find any teaching in *Jacobsen* of an optical system mounted within a side of the lower portion of the cradle housing and emitting a beam in a predetermined direction, as recited in Claim 1. The Examiner alleged that (306) is connected to (286), but a connection is not what is being claimed in Claim 1. Instead, “mounted within a side of the lower portion” is being claimed. The Examiner’s contention of some implied teaching of the optical system being part of the cradle housing in *Jacobsen*, without giving any support for or evidence of this contention, is respectfully without merit. It is respectfully asserted that the Examiner’s next contention of it being well-known to make separable portions integral is not only un-alleged in the rejection, but also further evidence of the Examiner’s inability to meet the structural limitations in Claim 1 with respect to the optical system.

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's rejection of Claims 1, 3 and 6 is incorrect, and should be withdrawn. Withdrawal of the same is respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection should be withdrawn at least in view of the foregoing arguments with respect to the rejection of Claims 1, 3 and 6 and further, since *Kapellner* fails to cure the stated deficiencies in *Morikawa* and *Jacobsen*. Withdrawal of the same, therefore, is respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection should be withdrawn at least in view of the foregoing arguments with respect to the rejection of Claims 1, 3 and 6 and further, since *Oyagi* fails to cure the stated deficiencies in *Morikawa* and *Jacobsen*. Withdrawal of the same, therefore, is respectfully requested.

Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-3 and 6-7, they are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on Claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2-3 and 6-7 are respectfully requested.

In view of the preceding remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims, namely Claims 1-3 and 6-7 are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicants

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM
333 Earle Ovington Blvd., Suite 701
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-3565
Fax: (516) 228-8475

PJF/RCC/dr